



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/915,716	07/26/2001	Leslie C. Smith	3968.037	6561

7590 06/02/2005

Evelyn A. Defillo  
Pendorf & Cutliff  
5111 Memorial Highway  
Tampa, FL 33634-7356

EXAMINER
----------

DELCOTTO, GREGORY R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1751

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/915,716

Applicant(s)

SMITH ET AL.

Examiner

Gregory R. Del Cotto

Art Unit

1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5, 7-14 and 16-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-3, 5 and 7-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13, 14, 16-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-14, and 16-21 are pending. Note that, Applicant's amendments and arguments filed 1/31/05 have been entered.

Applicant's election with traverse of Group II in the reply filed on 1/31/05 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the claims as amended are so closely related that it would not be burdensome on the Examiner to examine all of the claims: a novelty search of Group I should also satisfy the Examiner with respect to Group II without additional effort. This is not found persuasive because the inventions of Group I and Group II would each require a separate search due to their separate classification which would place an undue burden on the Examiner.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 1-3, 5, and 7-12 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 1/31/05.

### **Objections/Rejections Withdrawn**

The following objections/rejections as set forth in the Office action mailed 8.26.04 have been withdrawn:

None.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1751

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1751

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 13, 14, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Iliff et al (US 5,412,958).

Iliff et al teach a dry cleaning system particularly suited for employing supercritical CO<sub>2</sub> as the cleaning fluid consisting of a sealable cleaning vessel containing a rotatable drum adapted for holding a soiled substrate, a cleaning fluid storage vessel, and a gas vaporizer vessel for recycling used cleaning fluid. See Abstract. In a further embodiment, a smaller container is downstream of the main chamber and is preferably in-line with the liquid CO<sub>2</sub>. The purpose of the container is to

Art Unit: 1751

hold a means for imparting to the substrate cleaned by the cleaning vessel an aesthetic or commercially enhancing material soluble or dispersible in the dense or supercritical fluid, such as liquid CO<sub>2</sub>. One of the principal but not sole, uses for this means for imparting an aesthetic or commercially enhancing material would be scenting, preferably vegetative matter containing essential oils. The vegetative matter can include flower petals, herbs, bark, leaves, from which can be extracted essential oils or other compounds soluble in liquid CO<sub>2</sub>, such as camphor, menthol oils, orange oils, rose oils, and the like. See column 6, lines 45-69. Note that, the Examiner asserts that these oils as taught by Iliff et al would inherently have the same fragrance parameters as recited by the instant claims because Iliff et al teach fragrance ingredients which are the same as listed in the specification on page 4, lines 1-35 of the specification. Accordingly, the broad teachings of Iliff et al anticipate the material limitations of the instant claims.

Alternatively, even if the broad teachings of Iliff et al are not sufficient to anticipate the material limitations of the instant claims, it would have been nonetheless obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the claimed fragrance parameters of the composition in order to provide the optimum fragrance properties to the composition because Iliff et al teach that the amount and types of fragrances added to the composition may be varied.

Claims 13, 14, and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy (US 6,313,079) in view of Iliff et al (US 5,412,958).

Murphy teaches a surfactant comprising a heterocyclic group that results in superior cleaning in a dry cleaning system. The surfactant can have one or more heteroatom and can result in reverse micelle formation in a densified gas like densified carbon dioxide. See Abstract. Optional additives may also be used in the composition and include anti-static agents and deodorizing agents. The deodorizing agent typically includes fragrances such as those described in US 5,784,905 which is incorporated by reference. US 5,784,905 teaches that typical fragrances or scents such as natural or synthetic oils and related products. See column 3, lines 50-60.

Murphy does not teach the specific fragrance ingredients nor a fragrance system containing CO<sub>2</sub>, a fragrance system, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Iliff et al are relied upon as set forth above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use a fragrance system including orange oils in the composition taught by Murphy, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Iliff teaches the use of a fragrance system including orange oils in a similar CO<sub>2</sub> cleaning system, and further, Murphy teaches the use of essential oils and fragrances in general.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a fragrance system containing CO<sub>2</sub>, a fragrance system, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed components, because the broad teachings of

Art Unit: 1751

Murphy in combination with Iliff suggest a fragrance system containing CO<sub>2</sub>, a fragrance system, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

### ***Response to Arguments***

With respect to the rejection of the instant claims using Iliff et al or the rejection using Murphy in combination with Iliff et al, Applicant states that these references or combination of references fail to recognize that 60% of the fragrance ingredients have a relative fabric affinity value (y) of at least 4. Additionally, Applicant states that the inventors have identified a previously unrecognized parameter (y) that, unlike the teaching of Iliff, identifies fragrance systems suitable for use in a liquid CO<sub>2</sub> system. In response, note that, the Examiner asserts that the fragrances taught by Iliff et al would inherently have the same fabric affinity value as recited by the instant claims because Iliff et al teach essential oils and fragrances which are the same as listed in the instant specification (See page 4, lines 1-35 of specification). Note that, Applicant has provided no data showing how the compositions as taught by Iliff et al are different from the compositions as recited by the instant claims. Additionally, the Examiner asserts that Iliff et al is drawn to cleaning compositions containing fragrance(s) which are used to clean fabrics and therefore, it would be desirable to one skilled in the art to determine the optimum amounts and types of fragrances applied to a textile surface. Thus, the result-effective variable (y) as recited by the instant claims which represents fragrances which are substantive to the garments would be recognized by Iliff et al because Iliff et al teaches fragrances which would also need to be substantive to the textile surface.



With respect to the comparative data presented on pages 11-23 of the instant specification, Applicant states that this data shows that the fabric affinity value (y) is critical. In response, note that, the instant claims simply recite "fragrance system comprises fragrance ingredients"; the Examiner asserts that this "fragrance system" may be interpreted as requiring two, three, etc. fragrances. The claim does not require any specific number of fragrances. Additionally, it is unclear as to how the data shows the unexpected and superior properties of the claimed invention over compositions falling outside the scope of the instant claims. Furthermore, the instant claims are drawn to an incredibly large number of combinations of fragrances and any showing must be commensurate in scope with instant claims.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1751

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory R. Del Cotto whose telephone number is (571) 272-1312. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra Gupta can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Gregory R. Del Cotto  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1751

GRD  
May 31, 2005